

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,442	02/26/2004	Arthur Ashman	01527/100L635-US1	5006
7278 7590 03/07/2007 DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257			EXAMINER	
			BERMAN, SUSAN W	
NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	
			·	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Comment	10/789,442	ASHMAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Susan W. Berman	1711 ,
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply but will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e. cause the application to become ABANDI	ION. e timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	•	
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 E This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the condition	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters,	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34,91,94 and 95 is/are pending in the same state of the above claim(s) 29-34 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-28,91,94 and 95 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	a) accepted or b) object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ction is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applic prity documents have been rece tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 1711

Response to Arguments.

Applicant's arguments filed 12-14-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is not agreed, as argued by applicant, that Schaht does not teach polymers having an anhydride linkage. The disclosure of Schaht is not limited to what is exemplified. Schaht clearly teaches, as admitted by applicant, that polyanhydrides are suitable for the biodegradable region (column 6, line 34) and refers to Shastri for specific disclosure of useful polyanhydrides. The disadvantages from using polyanhydrides taught by Schaht do not preclude the usefulness of polyanhydrides in the absence of therapeutic agents having reactivity with the anhydride linkage. Furthermore, Schaht teaches that this disadvantage is overcome by indirectly incorporating therapeutic agents having reactivity with the anhydride linkage. Also, this teaching suggest that polyanhydrides can be used with any therapeutic agents not having reactivity with the anhydride linkage.

Applicant argues that the instant invention has new and useful properties compared with the Schaht polymers. This argument is not persuasive because the allegations are not supported by comparative data to show unexpected or significantly improved results. Examples 11-12 provide data with respect to mechanical strength as shown by compressive yield strain, compressive yield strength, and crushing load. However, there is no comparative data with respect to the closest prior art teaching, i.e. polymers as taught by Schaht containing polyanhydrides to provide a biodegradable region.

With respect to Anseth et al in view of Schaht: addition of a bone substitute is considered at least to be an addition of a "material as needed for a particular implant application", as

Art Unit: 1711

suggested by Anseth et al, and is also considered to be an addition of a filler or reinforcement material. The teaching of "other materials as needed for a particular implant application" is not considered to be vague since it refers to a "particular implant application" and is particularly relevant tot eh instantly claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 15-28, 91, 94 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schacht (6,933,328). Schacht discloses a composition comprising a crosslinkable prepolymer, a polyester, polyorthoester or polyacetal, and a mineral biologically active component for a bone implant or cement or a dental material. The crosslinkable multifunctional prepolymer in the second embodiment is preferably a polyester (column 3, line 60, to column 4, line 9). The polymerizable groups are ethylenic or acetylenic unsaturations (column 7, line 62, to column 8, line 7). Polymerization initiators, including photoinitiators and redox initiators, and a dual curing system are taught in column 12, lines 30-65. Compositions containing bone substitutes are taught in Examples 7 and 21. See Example 15, wherein a hydroxy carbonic acid oligomer is reacted with methacrylic anhydride followed by reaction of the carbonic acid group to provide an N-hydroxy-succinimidyl end group which is coupled to an oligopeptide. Example 21 discloses a combination of bone allograft and curable composite wherein the curable composition is

Art Unit: 1711

placed on top of an allograft filling. The difference from the instantly claimed invention is that the bone allograft and curable composition are not mixed or applied as a mixture.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to mix the bone allograft material taught by Schacht with the curable composition taught by Schacht instead of applying the components in layers. The reason is that Schacht teaches that various therapeutic agents, diagnostic agents and/or porosity forming agents can be added to the curable compositions. The synthetic bone allograft is considered to be a therapeutic agent. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation that the bone allograft in a mixture would have been secured in place by curing the curable composition. With respect to claims 25-28, the compositions taught by Schacht would be expected to provide the recited properties since the components taught by Schacht correspond to the components set forth in claim 1 or claim 24.

Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schacht (6,933,328), as applied to claims 1-4, 15-28, 91, 94 and 95 above, and further in view of Shastri et al (5,837,752) or Anseth et al (5,902,599). The disclosure of Schacht is discussed herein above. The difference from the instantly claimed invention is that Schacht does not specifically teach the methacrylic acid dianhydrides set forth in instant claims 5-14.

Shastri et al disclose semi-interpenetrating polymer networks comprising a linear hydrophobic degradable polymer and monomers or macromers inleuding an anhydride linkage. The compositions can include inorganic salts and proteinaceous materials (column 3, lines 21-34 and lines 51-59). The macromers containing ethylenically unsaturated polymerizable groups can be obtained from unsaturated dicarboxylic acids that provide water-soluble blocks.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to employ the ethylenically unsaturated macromer taught by Shastri et al in an analogous composition for repairing bones as the crosslinkable prepolymer in the composition containing a bone allograft suggested by

Art Unit: 1711

Schacht. Schacht provides motivation by teaching that the crosslinkable prepolymers are polyesters comprising polymerizable end groups and a biodegradable region from a poly-α-hydroxy acid or a polyanhydride or mixtures thereof (column 6, lines 29-35). Shastri et al provide motivation by teaching that the crosslinkable macromers can be polymerized to provide a porous polymer network and that they can be polymerized ex vivo or in situ to replace or repair bone. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by a reasonable expectation of providing a useful compositions for bone repair or replacement.

Claims 1-28, 91, 94 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anseth et al (5,902,599) in view of Schacht. Anseth et al disclose biodegradable polymer networks obtained by polymerizing anhydride prepolymers including unsaturated crosslinking groups. Methacrylic acid dianhydrides of diacids such as sebacic acid or 1,3-bis(p-carboxyphenoxy)-hexane are disclosed. Anseth et al teach that the prepolymers can be combined with fillers, reinforcing materials and/or other materials needed for a particular implant (column 7, lines 53-58). The disclosure of Schacht is discussed herein above. Anseth et al do not specifically disclose bone substitute materials as additives in the disclosed compositions.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to employ the bone allograft taught by Schacht as a material needed for a particular implant in combination with the crosslinkable anhydride prepolymers disclosed by Anseth et al. Anseth et al provide motivation by teaching that such materials can be added to the disclosed prepolymers. Schacht provides motivation by teaching that bone allograft cab be combined with an analogous compositions comprising analogous crosslinkable polyester prepolymers.

Art Unit: 1711

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan W. Berman whose telephone number is 571 272 1067. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571 272 1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,442 Page 7

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application
Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained
from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available
through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer
Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR
CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SB 2/22/07

Susan W Berman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1711